ISLAMENTARY: Journal of Islamic Elementary Education
E-ISSN: 2986-2140
Vol. 4, No. 2, November 2026

Integrating Ontology, Epistemology, and Axiology in the Development of Knowledge

Khaliq Imran
Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, Indonesia
Email: khaliqimran1612@gmail.com

M. Sattu Alam
Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, Indonesia
Email: sattualang31@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: Khaliq Imran
Article history: Received: August-31-2026| Revised: October-01-2026| Available Online: November-05-2026

ABSTRACT

The rapid development of knowledge raises fundamental questions concerning the reality investigated by science, the procedures through which valid knowledge is obtained, and the values that guide its application. These questions are addressed through ontology, epistemology, and axiology, three interrelated foundations of the philosophy of science. This article aims to explain the concepts, scopes, and principal schools of these three branches and to analyze their relationship as an integrated foundation for the development of knowledge. The study employs a qualitative library-research design and a descriptive-analytical approach. Data were collected through documentation of books on the philosophy of science and relevant scholarly articles. The materials were reduced, classified into ontological, epistemological, and axiological themes, interpreted through comparison of the authors' arguments, and synthesized to identify their conceptual relationships. The review indicates that ontology clarifies the nature and boundaries of the reality studied; epistemology explains the sources, methods, and justification of knowledge; and axiology evaluates the purposes, values, and consequences of its use through ethical and aesthetic considerations. Ontological assumptions influence the choice of epistemic methods, while the resulting knowledge requires axiological evaluation. In turn, social needs and ethical commitments can shape research questions and methodological choices. The article concludes that these dimensions should be understood as a connected framework so that scientific development remains coherent, meaningful, and responsible.

Keywords: Axiology; Epistemology; Philosophy of Science; Ontology; Scientific Knowledge.

Copyright © © 2026. The authors.
ISLAMENTARY: Journal of Islamic Elementary Education Volume is licensed under a Creative Commons
Non-Commercial Attribution 4.0 International License

INTRODUCTION

Scientific knowledge has developed rapidly and now influences almost every dimension of human life. Advances in technology, education, economics, health, and communication have expanded the capacity to explain and transform the world. Yet the accumulation of information and the refinement of research techniques do not automatically answer the fundamental questions that accompany scientific activity. Researchers still need to ask what kind of reality is being investigated, how claims about that reality can be justified, and for what purposes the resulting knowledge should be used. These questions indicate that science requires philosophical reflection in addition to technical competence.

The philosophy of science provides a framework for examining these fundamental questions through ontology, epistemology, and axiology. Ontology concerns the nature of being and the reality that becomes the object of inquiry. Epistemology examines the origin, structure, methods, and validity of knowledge. Axiology considers the values, purposes, and benefits associated with knowledge and its application (Bakhtiar, 2012; Suriasumantri, 2013; Tafsir, 2012). In simplified terms, the three dimensions address what is studied, how it can be known, and why the knowledge matters. Their questions are distinct, but they are not independent.

An unclear ontological position may leave the object and boundaries of a study insufficiently defined. A weak epistemological foundation may produce claims that cannot be adequately justified. Meanwhile, neglecting axiology may allow scientific findings to be applied without sufficient attention to moral responsibility or social consequences. The three dimensions therefore provide a basis for examining not only the internal coherence of research but also its relationship with human needs and values. Kattsoff (2004) and Gie (2007) explain the philosophical foundations of knowledge, while Suriasumantri (2013) places the questions of reality, method, and value within the broader structure of scientific thought.

In educational and research settings, ontology, epistemology, and axiology are sometimes introduced as separate concepts to be memorized. Such a presentation can obscure the way philosophical assumptions operate in actual research. A researcher may be skilled in selecting instruments and analyzing data but may not explicitly consider the assumptions about reality that make those instruments appropriate. Similarly, a study may produce technically valid findings while giving little attention to the interests, risks, or ethical implications associated with their use. The growing influence of technology makes this concern increasingly important because scientific and technological decisions can affect individuals, institutions, and communities.

Previous discussions have addressed the three branches from different perspectives. General works on the philosophy of science explain their definitions and scope (Bakhtiar, 2012; Gie, 2007; Suriasumantri, 2013; Tafsir, 2012). Bahrum (2013) discusses ontology, epistemology, and axiology as related dimensions of philosophical inquiry. Abadi (2016) examines axiology through the relationship between ethics, morals, and aesthetics, while Mayasari et al. (2022) connect the values of knowledge with Islamic thought. More recent discussions extend the analysis to the comparison of Western and Islamic perspectives (Ardafianti, 2024), the ethical foundations of scientific knowledge (Kallabe et al., 2025), and the foundations of modern science (Salsabila, 2026). Surajiyo and Dhika (2024) also consider the relationship between knowledge and ethics.

These studies provide important explanations, but the present article places particular emphasis on the relationship among the three dimensions as a connected structure of scientific inquiry. The discussion does not treat ontology, epistemology, and axiology merely as three independent definitions. Instead, it examines how assumptions about reality shape the ways in which knowledge is pursued, how the resulting claims are assessed, and how their consequences are evaluated. This integrated emphasis is intended to make the philosophical framework more applicable to students, educators, and researchers.

Based on this background, the article addresses two questions: first, what are the definitions, scopes, and principal schools of ontology, epistemology, and axiology; and second, how are these three branches interconnected as foundations of scientific knowledge? The objective is to explain

each branch systematically and to analyze the reciprocal relationship among them. The discussion is expected to support a more reflective understanding of research, particularly the need to align the object of inquiry, the method of obtaining knowledge, and the values guiding its use.

METHOD

This article uses a qualitative research design in the form of library research. Library research was selected because the object of analysis is a set of philosophical concepts and arguments presented in written sources, rather than phenomena requiring direct field observation or interviews. The study applies a descriptive-analytical approach: the principal concepts are first described systematically and are then analyzed to identify similarities, distinctions, and relationships among them. Primary materials consist of books on the philosophy of science, particularly the works of Bakhtiar (2012), Gie (2007), Suriasumantri (2013), and Tafsir (2012). Secondary materials include classical philosophical works and scholarly journal articles relevant to ontology, epistemology, axiology, and the ethics of knowledge. Data were collected through documentation by reading the selected sources, recording arguments relevant to the research questions, and organizing the recorded information by theme. Data analysis proceeded through four connected stages. First, data reduction selected passages relevant to the concepts, scopes, and schools of each branch. Second, classification organized the material into ontological, epistemological, and axiological categories. Third, interpretation compared arguments across sources and clarified the implications of each position. Fourth, synthesis brought the three categories together to explain their interdependence as a philosophical foundation of scientific activity. Because this is a literature-based study, its findings are conceptual interpretations of the reviewed sources and should not be understood as empirical measurements of researchers' or students' understanding.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The literature review indicates that ontology, epistemology, and axiology answer different but connected questions. Ontology identifies the reality that may become an object of knowledge; epistemology explains how claims about that reality are produced and justified; and axiology evaluates the values and purposes associated with the knowledge obtained. The following discussion explains each dimension before examining their relationship.

Ontology: The Nature and Scope of Reality

Ontology derives from the Greek terms ontos, meaning that which is, and logos, referring to discourse, theory, or systematic study. In philosophy, ontology examines the nature of existence and the fundamental character of reality, including entities that are directly observable and those that cannot be apprehended through ordinary sensory experience (Bahrum, 2013; Bagus, 2005; Kattsoff, 2004). In the context of science, ontological reflection helps clarify what is regarded as real and what can legitimately become an object of investigation. It also concerns the boundaries of a field of study and the relationship between the object investigated and human capacities for understanding it (Suriasumantri, 2013).

Ontological questions include whether an object exists independently of the observer, what kind of entity it is, and how it relates to other forms of reality. These questions are not merely abstract. They influence the way a researcher defines a problem, identifies relevant evidence, and determines the limits of a claim. If a study concerns a physical object, observation and measurement may be appropriate. If it concerns meaning, consciousness, or experience, the researcher may need to consider dimensions that cannot be reduced to physical measurement alone. Ontology thus provides an initial orientation for the design and interpretation of research.

Several schools of thought offer different answers to questions about the structure of reality. Monism maintains that reality is fundamentally one. Dualism argues that reality consists of two basic and irreducible dimensions, often illustrated through the distinction between matter and mind or body and soul. Pluralism, by contrast, understands reality as consisting of multiple fundamental elements. These positions represent different ways of explaining the basic composition of existence and the relationships among its dimensions (Bakhtiar, 2012; Tafsir, 2012).

Within monistic thought, materialism and idealism offer contrasting emphases. Materialism regards matter as the fundamental basis of reality. From this perspective, inquiry tends to prioritize phenomena that can be observed, described, or measured. Idealism gives priority to ideas, mind, or spiritual dimensions in explaining reality. These orientations can influence the kinds of questions researchers consider meaningful and the evidence they regard as relevant. They should therefore be understood not simply as labels but as assumptions that may guide the construction of knowledge.

The ontological positions described above also show why researchers should make their assumptions explicit. A study of social behavior, for example, may treat social structures as observable realities, while another may focus on the meanings individuals attach to their actions. The difference does not necessarily mean that one inquiry is scientific and the other is not. Rather, the object and the assumptions about its nature affect the form of evidence and the method needed to investigate it. Ontological clarity helps prevent a mismatch between the research question and the method selected.

Ontology also requires attention to the limits of scientific claims. A method can provide information about a particular aspect of reality without exhausting the reality as a whole. Measurement may describe observable characteristics, but it may not fully explain subjective meaning or moral significance. Conversely, interpretation of meaning does not automatically establish measurable causal relationships. Recognizing the nature and limits of the object allows researchers to formulate conclusions proportionate to the evidence.

Epistemology: Sources, Methods, and Validity of Knowledge

Epistemology comes from the Greek word episteme, meaning knowledge, and logos, meaning discourse or systematic study. It examines the origin, structure, methods, and validity of knowledge (Gie, 2007; Tafsir, 2012). Its central questions concern the sources from which knowledge arises, the procedures through which it is acquired, and the criteria used to distinguish justified knowledge from error. Epistemology therefore addresses the process by which a claim becomes acceptable as knowledge rather than remaining an unsupported opinion.

Rationalism emphasizes reason as a principal source of reliable knowledge. Rationalist approaches give an important role to logical relations, conceptual clarity, and the capacity of the mind to derive conclusions. Empiricism, in contrast, emphasizes sensory experience as the basis of knowledge. Hume (2007) explains that ideas are related to impressions arising from experience. These positions highlight different sources of knowledge: rational reflection and experience. In research practice, both reasoning and empirical evidence are important, although their relative roles may differ according to the object and question under investigation.

Criticism, associated with Kant (1998), seeks to examine the conditions that make knowledge possible and to relate experience to the structures or capacities of the mind. This position does not simply choose reason over experience or experience over reason. Instead, it emphasizes that knowledge involves the contribution of both. Positivism gives priority to knowledge that can be examined through empirical procedures and verifiable observation. Its emphasis on observable evidence has influenced the development of scientific methods, especially in fields that seek systematic description, measurement, and explanation.

These schools demonstrate that the question of knowledge cannot be reduced to the choice of a single technique. A method is appropriate when it corresponds to the question being asked and the assumptions made about the object. Empirical observation is essential for claims about observable events, while logical analysis is needed to assess consistency and inference. Research into meaning and experience may require interpretive procedures. Epistemological reflection helps explain why a method is selected and what kind of conclusion that method can support.

In scientific inquiry, the method is often described as logico-hypothetico-verificative: a mode of reasoning that combines deductive and inductive logic and tests hypotheses against facts (Suriasumantri, 2013). Deductive reasoning moves from general propositions to particular implications, whereas inductive reasoning develops broader patterns or propositions from particular observations. Scientific work may move repeatedly between these directions. A hypothesis is

formulated through reasoning, examined in relation to evidence, and revised when the evidence does not support it.

Epistemology also concerns theories of truth. The correspondence theory regards a statement as true when it corresponds to facts or conditions in reality. The coherence theory evaluates a statement through its consistency with other accepted propositions within a system of thought. The pragmatic theory considers the practical consequences or functioning of an idea (Russell, 1912; Suriasumantri, 2013). These theories offer different criteria for evaluating claims. They should be applied with awareness of the type of statement being assessed and the standards of the relevant field.

Popper (1959) emphasizes falsifiability as a distinguishing feature of scientific theories: a scientific claim must be open to testing in ways that could show it to be false. This principle highlights the provisional character of scientific knowledge. Kuhn (1962), meanwhile, explains scientific development through paradigms and paradigm shifts. Scientific communities work within shared assumptions and standards, but anomalies and intellectual changes can eventually transform the dominant framework. Together, these perspectives underline that scientific knowledge is open to criticism, revision, and development.

Epistemological responsibility therefore requires researchers to explain their sources, procedures, and standards of justification. A conclusion should not be presented as more certain than the evidence allows. Researchers should identify limitations, consider alternative explanations, and distinguish between data and interpretation. Such practices strengthen the credibility of knowledge and make it possible for other researchers to examine, reproduce, or challenge the reasoning that supports a claim.

Axiology: Values, Ethics, and the Use of Knowledge

Axiology derives from the Greek word axios, meaning value, and logos, referring to systematic study. It examines the values associated with knowledge, including its purpose, usefulness, and consequences. Suriasumantri (2013) describes axiology as a theory concerned with values in knowledge. Its scope includes ethics, which examines good and bad conduct, and aesthetics, which considers beauty and related judgments (Bakhtiar, 2012; Tafsir, 2012). Axiology thus asks not only whether knowledge can be obtained but also what should be done with it.

Ethics is especially important when scientific knowledge affects human beings, institutions, or the environment. Research may involve decisions about the selection of problems, the treatment of participants, the management of information, and the communication of findings. The ethical dimension requires attention to responsibility, fairness, honesty, and the possible consequences of scientific activity. A technically sound procedure does not by itself guarantee that the research purpose or its application is morally acceptable.

Aesthetics represents another dimension of value. Although it is often associated with art and beauty, its place in axiology indicates that human evaluation is not limited to questions of utility or moral permissibility. Aesthetic values may be relevant to the way knowledge is communicated, represented, and integrated into human experience. The inclusion of ethics and aesthetics demonstrates that axiology addresses a broad field of value judgments rather than a narrow assessment of practical benefit.

Recent discussions emphasize that values and ethics should function as normative considerations in the development and use of science. Kallabe et al. (2025) discuss values and scientific ethics from an axiological perspective, while Abadi (2016) examines the relationship among ethics, morals, and aesthetics. Mayasari et al. (2022) consider axiology in relation to knowledge and Islamic thought. These discussions reinforce the idea that scientific development should contribute to human welfare and should not be evaluated solely through intellectual or technological advancement.

In practical research, axiological questions arise at every stage. The choice of a research topic reflects judgments about which problems deserve attention. Decisions about methods may involve balancing the value of obtaining information against possible risks. The interpretation and

dissemination of findings can affect how knowledge is understood and applied. Axiological reflection therefore cannot be postponed until after research has been completed; it should inform the research process from its initial design to the communication of results.

An axiological perspective also distinguishes the possession of knowledge from the responsible use of knowledge. Scientific findings can be used in ways that benefit society, but they can also be misused or produce unintended harm. For that reason, researchers and institutions need to consider who benefits, who may be affected, and what responsibilities accompany the application of findings. The value of science is not measured only by the quantity of information produced, but also by the quality of its contribution to human life.

The Interrelationship of Ontology, Epistemology, and Axiology

Ontology, epistemology, and axiology form an interconnected framework for understanding scientific activity. Ontology establishes assumptions about the reality that becomes the object of inquiry. Those assumptions influence epistemological decisions concerning the sources of evidence, the methods of investigation, and the standards by which claims are justified. The resulting knowledge is then evaluated axiologically in terms of its value, purpose, and moral implications (Suriasumantri, 2013). The three dimensions therefore function as mutually related components rather than isolated topics.

The relationship can be understood as a sequence of conceptual questions. First, the researcher clarifies what is being investigated and what kind of reality the object represents. Second, the researcher determines how that reality can be known and what evidence is needed. Third, the researcher considers the purpose and consequences of producing and applying the knowledge. This sequence is useful for explaining the logic of research, although it should not be interpreted as a rigid linear process. In practice, values can shape the choice of research problem, and methodological findings can lead researchers to reconsider their initial assumptions about reality.

An ontological assumption may guide the selection of an epistemological approach. If the object is understood primarily as a measurable physical phenomenon, observation and quantitative measurement may be suitable. If the object involves meanings, interpretations, or lived experiences, methods that examine context and subjective understanding may be more appropriate. This does not establish a hierarchy between methods. It indicates that methodological choices should be justified in relation to the nature of the object and the research question.

Epistemology, in turn, influences the strength and limits of the knowledge that can be claimed. The choice of method determines what kind of evidence is collected and how it can be interpreted. A method that is poorly matched to the object may generate incomplete or misleading conclusions. The epistemological dimension therefore requires transparency about data sources, procedures, analytical steps, and the criteria used to evaluate results. It also requires openness to correction when new evidence or stronger arguments become available.

Axiology evaluates the knowledge produced through these processes. It asks whether the research contributes to a meaningful purpose, whether its methods and outcomes respect ethical principles, and whether its application is likely to support or harm human welfare. This evaluation may also influence the beginning of research: social needs, institutional responsibilities, and ethical restrictions can determine which problems are prioritized and which methods are acceptable. Thus, the relationship among the three dimensions is reciprocal rather than exclusively one-directional.

The integrated framework can be summarized as follows: ontology concerns the nature of the object; epistemology concerns the justification of knowledge about that object; and axiology concerns the values and consequences associated with the knowledge. The table below presents the principal distinctions and their connections.

Table 1. Comparison of Ontology, Epistemology, and Axiology

Dimension	Central Question	Main Concern	Relationship to Research

Ontology	What exists or is being studied?	Nature and scope of reality	Defines the object and boundaries of inquiry
Epistemology	How can it be known?	Sources, methods, and validity of knowledge	Guides evidence collection and justification
Axiology	Why does the knowledge matter?	Values, ethics, aesthetics, and usefulness	Evaluates purpose and consequences

Source: Authors' analysis based on the literature reviewed.

Implications for Scientific and Islamic Knowledge

The integrated discussion has implications for the way students and researchers understand scientific responsibility. Learning the definitions of ontology, epistemology, and axiology is important, but conceptual knowledge becomes more meaningful when applied to research decisions. Students should be encouraged to identify the assumptions underlying their research objects, explain why particular methods are appropriate, and reflect on the ethical and social implications of their findings. This approach can strengthen the connection between philosophical learning and research practice.

In the context of Islamic scholarship, the relationship between knowledge and value is particularly significant. The source literature included in this review discusses the relationship between axiology and Islamic thought (Mayasari et al., 2022) and compares Western and Islamic perspectives on philosophy, science, and knowledge (Ardafianti, 2024). These discussions provide a basis for considering scientific activity not only in terms of the production of explanations but also in relation to ethical commitments and human responsibility. The present review does not formulate a separate theology of knowledge; rather, it emphasizes that the philosophical dimensions of science should be considered together when knowledge is developed and used.

From this perspective, scientific progress should not be measured only by methodological sophistication or the volume of discoveries. The object of inquiry must be clearly understood, the claims must be supported by defensible procedures, and the use of findings must be considered in light of values and responsibilities. This integrated orientation can help prevent a separation between intellectual achievement and ethical reflection. It also encourages researchers to recognize that the benefits of knowledge depend partly on the purposes and practices through which it is applied.

The framework is also useful for evaluating research quality. Ontological clarity helps determine whether the research problem and object are adequately defined. Epistemological clarity makes the design, evidence, and reasoning open to examination. Axiological clarity makes the purpose and possible consequences visible. These dimensions can be used as reflective questions during proposal development, supervision, peer review, and the assessment of published research. They do not replace discipline-specific standards, but they provide a philosophical basis for examining the coherence and responsibility of scientific work.

At the institutional level, integrating the three dimensions can support a research culture that values rigor and responsibility. Research guidance should not focus exclusively on technical procedures such as sampling, instruments, or data analysis. It should also invite researchers to explain the assumptions that frame their objects and to anticipate ethical issues arising from their work. In this way, philosophical reflection becomes part of the practical quality assurance of research rather than an abstract addition to methodological training.

CONCLUSION

Ontology, epistemology, and axiology are three fundamental and interrelated branches of the philosophy of science. Ontology examines the nature and scope of the reality that becomes the object of inquiry, including different positions such as monism, dualism, pluralism, materialism, and idealism. Epistemology examines the sources, methods, and validity of knowledge through perspectives such as rationalism, empiricism, criticism, and positivism, as well as theories of truth

and the possibility of scientific correction. Axiology examines the values, purposes, and consequences of knowledge through ethical and aesthetic considerations.

The central finding of this literature review is that the three dimensions cannot be adequately understood as independent foundations. Ontological assumptions influence the selection of epistemological methods; epistemological procedures determine the strength and limits of knowledge claims; and axiological reflection evaluates the purpose and consequences of the knowledge produced. The relationship is reciprocal because social needs and ethical values can also shape research questions and methodological choices. A comprehensive understanding of the three dimensions is therefore necessary to support scientific development that is coherent, meaningful, and responsible.

Further studies may examine how students and researchers apply these philosophical foundations in specific disciplines or investigate empirically how the integration of ontology, epistemology, and axiology is reflected in research design and practice.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank the academic community whose published works provided the literature for this study. No external research grant or funding contract was identified in the source manuscript.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abadi, T. W. (2016). Aksiologi: Antara etika, moral, dan estetika. KANAL: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi, 4(2), 187–204. https://doi.org/10.21070/kanal.v4i2.1452

Ardafianti, R. (2024). Pandangan Barat dan Islam terhadap filsafat, ilmu, dan pengetahuan. Maliki Interdisciplinary Journal, 2(5), 198–208.

Bagus, L. (2005). Kamus filsafat. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Bahrum, B. (2013). Ontologi, epistemologi dan aksiologi. Sulesana: Jurnal Wawasan Keislaman, 8(2), 35–45. https://doi.org/10.24252/.v8i2.1276

Bakhtiar, A. (2012). Filsafat ilmu. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

Frondizi, R. (2001). Pengantar filsafat nilai (C. A. Wijaya, Trans.). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Gie, T. L. (2007). Pengantar filsafat ilmu. Yogyakarta: Liberty.

Hume, D. (2007). An enquiry concerning human understanding (P. Millican, Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1748).

Kallabe, N. A., Munir, M., & Ismail, I. (2025). Nilai dan etika ilmu pengetahuan dalam perspektif aksiologi filsafat ilmu. Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar, 10(4), 335–347. https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v10i04.38808

Kant, I. (1998). Critique of pure reason (P. Guyer & A. W. Wood, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1781).

Kattsoff, L. O. (2004). Pengantar filsafat (S. Soemargono, Trans.). Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mayasari, A., Natsir, N. F., & Haryanti, E. (2022). Aksiologi ilmu pengetahuan dan keislaman. JIIP: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan, 5(1), 218–225. https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v5i1.401

Popper, K. R. (1959). The logic of scientific discovery. London: Hutchinson.

Russell, B. (1912). The problems of philosophy. London: Williams and Norgate.

Salsabila, A. N. (2026). Landasan filsafat ilmu modern: Eksplorasi ontologi, epistemologi, dan aksiologi. Maliki Interdisciplinary Journal, 4(6), 2412–2420.

Surajiyo, S., & Dhika, H. (2024). Relasi ilmu dan etika: Sebuah kajian filsafat ilmu. IKRA-ITH HUMANIORA: Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora, 8(3), 140–150. https://doi.org/10.37817/ikraith-humaniora.v8i3.4192

Suriasumantri, J. S. (2013). Filsafat ilmu: Sebuah pengantar populer. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan.

Tafsir, A. (2012). Filsafat ilmu: Mengurai ontologi, epistemologi, dan aksiologi pengetahuan. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Zed, M. (2008). Metode penelitian kepustakaan. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.